

election. But declarations were made on Saturday last by a prominent candidate which, taken in connection with what he had since said, induced him to decline at this time to vote for the resolution before the House. Without entering into details, he would state that he understood the candidate of those who call themselves Republicans to have placed himself on the extreme and most odious ground that had ever been maintained in this country by any set of Abolitionists.

He had understood that candidate, in responding to the questions as to the superiority of the white or black race, to express his willingness to vote in favor of the white race, and that, but by some other text which he had proposed. He had understood the gentleman not only to assert that the black was equal to the white, but that he was anxious to see the two races in the end would prove superior to the other. He was gratified to know that certain gentlemen who had been so long in the House, and who were so well known to the House, were so much disgusted with any such doctrine; and, although they might agree with him in some of the politics of the day, yet were not prepared to go so far as to declare that the white race was superior to the black. He was gratified to know that certain gentlemen who had been so long in the House, and who were so well known to the House, were so much disgusted with any such doctrine; and, although they might agree with him in some of the politics of the day, yet were not prepared to go so far as to declare that the white race was superior to the black.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, had no intention to discuss, as the gentleman from North Carolina had shown his willingness to do the same principle which had been proclaimed by the various candidates for the Speakership. He should, however, like to do so and compare their declarations with their platform on some other occasion. He had risen for the purpose of explaining the reason why he had heretofore and why he should now vote against the plurality rule. This necessity had not been met, and he had been charged in the newspapers and perhaps intended on this floor that he was not acting in good faith in reference to the candidate for whom he had voted.

He happened to be a member of the House in 1849, when for the first time in the history of this Government, there was a departure from the system of electing a Speaker by the House of Representatives. At that time, and well recollected that his venerable colleague (Mr. GIDDINGS) and some seven or eight others held the balance of power in the House. After they had no longer been able to vote, they were expelled from the House. Three weeks various efforts were made to enact the plurality rule, which finally succeeded. He remembered that the little minority contended that they had not been expelled from the House, and their constituents were disfranchised by the adoption of that rule, and insisted that so long as they were in the House, they should have the right to vote. The candidate it was unjust on the part of the House to disfranchise them. Although he disagreed with them, and voted constantly for Mr. Wadsworth against the plurality rule, he was determined to adhere to the rule; that he had opposed it on principle, and was against it now.

He had sought this occasion to make known these reasons to the House and the country, that the tongue of slander, so far as he was concerned, might be stopped. He demanded the previous question, in accordance with a promise made to Mr. WADSWORTH when he took the floor.

Mr. BANKS then asked and obtained the consent of the House to make a single observation. He said that he had been very much interested by the honorable gentleman from North Carolina upon the subject to which he has referred.

Mr. CLINGMAN had no desire to do injustice to the gentleman who had just spoken. He had understood the gentleman to have said that he was in the equality of the white and black races he had understood him to say that there were two races in the world, the white and the black, and that he was willing to wait the development of time to ascertain whether the white race would absorb the black, or whether the black race would absorb the white. He had understood the gentleman, therefore, as looking to this test, though he did not know whether he had said that he was in favor of seeing the experiment made, or whether he was in favor of waiting until the development of time should show the result. He had understood the gentleman to say that he was in the equality of the white and black races he had understood him to say that there were two races in the world, the white and the black, and that he was willing to wait the development of time to ascertain whether the white race would absorb the black, or whether the black race would absorb the white.

Mr. CLINGMAN thought that the extract recited precisely with what he had stated. He confessed that it had surprised him that a person with the education and attainments of the gentleman from North Carolina should have expressed himself in such a manner. If he had done the gentleman justice, he of course regretted it; but he thought he would see that his inference was a correct one.

Mr. BANKS did not complain of injustice, but simply declined any such remark as the gentleman had implied to him.

The one hundred and fourteenth ballot was then had, and resulted as follows:

Mr. Banks..... 93  
Mr. Richardson..... 66  
Mr. Fuller..... 33  
Mr. Giddings..... 10  
Scattering..... 8

Whole number of votes..... 210

Necessity a choice..... 105

There having been no election, at three o'clock the House adjourned.

Wednesday, January 10, 1856.

The Senate was not in session today.

House of Representatives.

Mr. THORNTON offered a resolution that L. C. Campbell be declared Speaker of the thirty-fourth Congress of the United States. He did not expect, in submitting the proposition, to effect an election of Speaker, but he was disposed to give the House the name of Mr. CAMPBELL, because he had heard him spoken of as not so objectionable to some portions of the House as Mr. BAYLIS.

Mr. GALLAGHER said that Mr. CAMPBELL was his personal preference, but that he could be assured the sentiment of the House was in favor of Mr. CLINGMAN, who had been consistently chosen for that position, (from Mr. BANKS).

Mr. GIDDINGS remarked that the resolution

had been introduced here without consultation with those who were voting for Mr. Banks; and he should stand where he was until he could have some hope that a change of his vote would be for the better.

Mr. MACE said that the fault of the House not being organized, is attributed to the anti-Nebreska party, which is in a majority here, and can elect a Speaker any day if they will only surrender men for principle.

Mr. PURVANCE differed from Mr. MACE, and thought that the responsibility of an organization rests upon the democrats.

Mr. SHELMAN said that the responsibility rests on those gentlemen, who, professing to be anti-Nebreska men, yet separate from those who entertain similar views on that subject, and who are voting for Mr. Banks.

Several other gentlemen explained their positions and the reasons for voting either for or against the resolution, when the question having been taken, it was rejected yeas 50, nays 150.

Mr. CUMBACK offered a resolution that the Hon. DANIEL MACE, of Indiana, be declared Speaker of the House.

Mr. SHELMAN explained the reasons why he could not vote for Mr. Banks, and took occasion to severely criticize the action of those who are now voting for the last named gentleman.

Several gentlemen took part in the debate which ensued, and the vote was confined to those who avowed themselves opposed to the Kansas-Nebreska act.

Mr. CUMBACK withdrew his resolution.

The House then proceeded to vote for a Speaker:

Mr. Banks, of Mass..... 88  
Mr. Richardson, of N. J..... 65  
Mr. Buckner, of Ky..... 23  
Mr. Pennington, of N. C..... 10  
Scattering..... 5

Whole number of votes..... 191

Necessity a choice..... 95

[During the roll call, Messrs. BOYCE and McQUEEN severally remarked they were now satisfied with the explanation made by Mr. RICHARDSON, and that they would vote for him; but could not under present circumstances vote in favor of the plurality rule.]

Mr. WASHINGTON of Maine, had yielded the floor to the gentleman from North Carolina upon the question that he desired to submit some remarks with reference to his position upon the question of the plurality rule. He would not enter into details, but he would state that he had been very much interested by the honorable gentleman from North Carolina upon the subject to which he has referred.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, had no intention to discuss, as the gentleman from North Carolina had shown his willingness to do the same principle which had been proclaimed by the various candidates for the Speakership. He should, however, like to do so and compare their declarations with their platform on some other occasion. He had risen for the purpose of explaining the reason why he had heretofore and why he should now vote against the plurality rule. This necessity had not been met, and he had been charged in the newspapers and perhaps intended on this floor that he was not acting in good faith in reference to the candidate for whom he had voted.

He happened to be a member of the House in 1849, when for the first time in the history of this Government, there was a departure from the system of electing a Speaker by the House of Representatives. At that time, and well recollected that his venerable colleague (Mr. GIDDINGS) and some seven or eight others held the balance of power in the House. After they had no longer been able to vote, they were expelled from the House. Three weeks various efforts were made to enact the plurality rule, which finally succeeded. He remembered that the little minority contended that they had not been expelled from the House, and their constituents were disfranchised by the adoption of that rule, and insisted that so long as they were in the House, they should have the right to vote. The candidate it was unjust on the part of the House to disfranchise them. Although he disagreed with them, and voted constantly for Mr. Wadsworth against the plurality rule, he was determined to adhere to the rule; that he had opposed it on principle, and was against it now.

He had sought this occasion to make known these reasons to the House and the country, that the tongue of slander, so far as he was concerned, might be stopped. He demanded the previous question, in accordance with a promise made to Mr. WADSWORTH when he took the floor.

Mr. BANKS then asked and obtained the consent of the House to make a single observation. He said that he had been very much interested by the honorable gentleman from North Carolina upon the subject to which he has referred.

Mr. CLINGMAN had no desire to do injustice to the gentleman who had just spoken. He had understood the gentleman to have said that he was in the equality of the white and black races he had understood him to say that there were two races in the world, the white and the black, and that he was willing to wait the development of time to ascertain whether the white race would absorb the black, or whether the black race would absorb the white.

Mr. CLINGMAN thought that the extract recited precisely with what he had stated. He confessed that it had surprised him that a person with the education and attainments of the gentleman from North Carolina should have expressed himself in such a manner. If he had done the gentleman justice, he of course regretted it; but he thought he would see that his inference was a correct one.

Mr. BANKS did not complain of injustice, but simply declined any such remark as the gentleman had implied to him.

The one hundred and fourteenth ballot was then had, and resulted as follows:

Mr. Banks..... 93  
Mr. Richardson..... 66  
Mr. Fuller..... 33  
Mr. Giddings..... 10  
Scattering..... 8

Whole number of votes..... 210

Necessity a choice..... 105

There having been no election, at three o'clock the House adjourned.

Wednesday, January 10, 1856.

The Senate was not in session today.

House of Representatives.

Mr. THORNTON offered a resolution that L. C. Campbell be declared Speaker of the thirty-fourth Congress of the United States. He did not expect, in submitting the proposition, to effect an election of Speaker, but he was disposed to give the House the name of Mr. CAMPBELL, because he had heard him spoken of as not so objectionable to some portions of the House as Mr. BAYLIS.

Mr. GALLAGHER said that Mr. CAMPBELL was his personal preference, but that he could be assured the sentiment of the House was in favor of Mr. CLINGMAN, who had been consistently chosen for that position, (from Mr. BANKS).

Mr. GIDDINGS remarked that the resolution

Washington Sentinel.

EDITED BY  
WM. M. OVERTON, CH. MAURICE SMITH,  
AND BEVERLEY TUCKER.

THURSDAY MORNING, JAN. 11, 1856.

CONGRESSIONAL.

The Senate was not in session yesterday.

In the House of Representatives, Mr. Thornton offered a resolution declaring Hon. L. D. Campbell Speaker of the House. This was rejected by a vote of yeas 50, nays 150.

A vote was taken, viva voce, for Speaker, but with no result which looks to a speedy choice of a presiding officer.

THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

He has delayed the printing of this interesting report, for the purpose of accompanying it with some comments. It is from the pen of one educated at West Point, and who has seen active service in the eventful war with Mexico. With such advantages in military experience, and his familiarity as a statesman with the wants of the country, the report, as might be expected, presents many matters that should command the most considerate and candid attention of every one. What he has to state is, perspicuously stated, and supported by very forcible arguments and convincing facts.

The view taken of the importance of a railroad communication with California must arrest universal attention. The report does not exaggerate its importance in time of war; and, in truth, should a war with a maritime power be brought on, we may well apprehend that the report shows the minimum of the evils which will be felt for the want of such a road. How this road is to be made—when, and by whom, are questions which will require separate discussion. But the reforms and improvements proposed in the report are well worthy of close examination, and if the reasons given prove satisfactory, as in many cases we have no doubt they will, we trust such action will be had as shall secure them. If this report receives the consideration and action which it deserves, the execution of it will leave a lasting impression of his presence in that department, of which he may well be proud.

As we shall have occasion to refer, frequently, to this report, and as we are cramped for room in this number, we will postpone further comment for the present, and in future numbers discuss, *seriatim*, such portions as would seem to require particular notice.

The same cause—want of space—which prevents extended commentary on this paper, has applied to all the reports of the heads of departments. From time to time we shall call attention to the more prominent recommendations contained in each of them.

EQUALITY OF THE WHITE AND BLACK RACES—CONGRESS—MR. BANKS OF MASSACHUSETTS.

"I have to say, in this matter, that I accept the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal. In regard to the superiority of races, I am impressed with the conviction that it is to be determined only by capacity for endurance. So far as I have studied the subject, it seems to me to be the universal law, that the weaker is always absorbed and disappears in the stronger race. Whether the black race of this continent, or any other part of the world, is equal to the white race, can only be determined by the absorption and disappearance of one or the other; and I propose to wait until the respective races can be properly subjected to this philosophical test before I give a decisive answer."

When the House of Representatives the other day indulged itself in the sportive exercise of questioning and cross-questioning the various candidates for the high and honorable office of Speaker, much anxiety was manifested to hear the confessions of faith made by those candidates. Their statements have now been before the public for several days, and have, no doubt, been as anxiously studied, without, as within Congress, by readers as by listeners. It is with one of these statements only that we propose to deal, and that is the statement of the honorable candidate from Massachusetts, Mr. Banks.

We are not of those who believe that conductors of newspapers must imitate the unworthy examples of fish women and drunken sailors. We do not believe that they are called upon to curse and to swear at every man whose conduct they disapprove, and to change political, into personal issues. An editor is no more entitled to use denunciation and epithet than any other man. And, although editors ourselves, we must say that we cannot claim for the respected profession to which we belong, any higher degree of patriotism, however much members of it may rave and rant, than can justly be claimed by any other class of our citizens.

But if we were of those who claim for the members of the editorial profession a superior patriotism, and deemed indignant denunciation and opprobrious epithet the fit phrases to apply to those whose sentiments we disapproved, we could not refrain from applying such phrases to the distinguished member from Massachusetts, who, for the last six weeks, has been nimbly running for the Speakership, and who, in the language of a poet has been—

"Full in the sight of Paradise,  
Beholding Heaven, but feeling hell."

Nothing is more discouraging, nothing better calculated to excite apprehension than a contemplation of the rapid strides which Abolitionism has made in the Capitol of this great country. It has been but a few short years since the expression, in an humble manner even, of ungodly opinions on the slavery question, was deemed so treasonable as to call down unparagoned denunciation, unmeasured insult, and sometimes personal chastisement. But now at the opening of the year 1856, such sentiments are expressed with unblushing effrontery, and accompanied with a strut and a swagger.

Not only are such sentiments thus expressed, but absolutely, and we can hardly realize the fact, the largest party in the House of Representatives is the Free Soil party, and the largest vote for Speaker has persistently, for the last six weeks, been cast for the Free Soil candidate. Nor is this all! That Free Soil candidate has in the Capitol of the country, and in the face of the white American nation, deliberately de-

clared that he cannot decide whether the race and color to which he belongs, and who founded this Government, is superior or inferior, or equal, to the negro race who were brought as savages to this country by men of England and men of New England, and sold as slaves to the Southern colonists.

The Massachusetts candidate for the speakership also speaks of "absorption," which Mr. Clingman, of North Carolina, very properly understood to mean "amalgamation." If right in this rendering the phrase, it is indeed humiliating to think that the most prominent candidate—for he commands the largest vote—for the Speakership of the American House of Representatives, holds and boldly avows so monstrous and odious a sentiment as amalgamation, association, equality social and political, and marriage, between the white and black races!

Things have indeed come to a high pass, when a talented and cultivated member of Congress from the scholastic State of Massachusetts, announces to the Congress, for the Speakership of which he is a candidate, that he really cannot decide whether or not so many negroes are not their equals—may, their superiors! Indeed, he cannot tell, until it is "determined by the absorption and disappearance of one or the other," which is the best, the white or the black race—which is the superior, himself, or the odorous big buck negro, whose whole ambition is to scratch his nappy head, to warm himself in the sun, and to eat, drink, and sleep.

Such are the claims of the Hon. Mr. Banks to the Speakership of the American Congress. What, after such sentiments, would be thought abroad, of his election, we leave our readers to decide.

ANOTHER TERRIBLE ACCIDENT.—Another fearful occurrence has taken place on the Hudson River railroad, by which certainly three or more persons have lost their lives. It appears that the Sunday night train, which left Albany at a quarter past four, on reaching the bridge over Spuyten Duyvil Creek, caused the bridge to give way, and part of the train, consisting of two engines, two freight cars, the mail and baggage car, and one passenger car, were precipitated into the water. The bridge gave way just this side of the draw. A train with thirty cars had only a few hours before crossed over safely.

The train had three passenger cars attached but only one went over, and partly in the water. The passengers were all thrown upon one end in the front part of the car, when it went down. As the remaining cars caught upon one of the iron bars it prevented them from going over, and also, the first passenger car from going entirely into the water. Had it not been for this, there would have been many lives lost.

Mr. John Upton, the Messenger of Wells, Butterfield & Co.'s American Express, was among the injured. He was severely bruised—his ankle dislocated and one of the small bones of his leg broken. He had in his charge nearly a million of dollars, but notwithstanding his severe injuries he refused to leave his Express and remained in the cars seven hours in the cold with the Express matter. No instance of courage and endurance like this has ever been on record.

Pennsylvania United States Senator.

On Monday the Hon. William Bigler, ex-Governor of Pennsylvania, was elected to represent that State in the Senate of the United States, vice the Hon. James Cooper, whose term expired on the 4th of March last. He received eighty-four votes. Gov. Bigler, says the *Baltimore Sun*, was at one time a journeyman printer, and is now elevated to one of the most distinguished deliberative bodies in the world, and will no doubt prove, in every respect, worthy of the high honor conferred upon him.

THE EXPLOSION OF GAS AT PITTSBURGH.—It has heretofore been stated that on Saturday morning last John Brown, colored, keeper of a second hand clothing store in Pittsburgh, went into his place of business, with a lighted match, when a tremendous explosion took place, in consequence of the room being filled with escaped gas. The explosion, it appears, was felt a distance of several squares, and by many was supposed to be the shock of an earthquake. The Dispatch says:

The windows and doors of the room occupied by Brown were instantly blown out, shattered into fragments, the floor blown from the joints, some of which were broken—and he himself blown to the ceiling, falling into the cellar, very severely injured. The force of the explosion was so great that the main walls of the entire building were much shaken, though not permanently injured, and the partitions between the rooms in the second story torn from their fastenings to the walls.

In the cellar, which was a large one, and is the place where there was the greatest accumulation of gas, (which appears to have escaped into it through a break in one of the main pipes on Grand street, caused by the settling of the earth used in filling an old well, over which the pipe was placed,) a nine inch wall was blown down. The bulkhead under the stairway which leads to the second story in the hall was shivered to atoms; the walls were denuded of their paper and plastering; in the parlor above the store, a heavy stone mantle and fire place was forced from its place and broken into fragments; the hearth stones were split in pieces, and in fact there is no portion of the building which has not suffered in a similar manner.

Had it not been for the extent of the cellar, which (acting as a safety-valve), gave room for the explosive force to expend itself in that direction, it is not probable that the building would have withstood the severe shock. So great was the force of the concussion that windows were blown in or broken in the dwelling of Mr. John Green, on the other side of Third street.

Health.—The City Councils have passed a bill for the establishment of a Board of Health, the appointment of a Commissioner of Health, etc.; the former not being considered sufficient to carry out necessary sanitary purposes.

Ladies Benevolent Society.—The following are the names of the officers and managers of the Union Benevolent and Employment Society:

Mrs. Mills, Mrs. Macomb, Mrs. Eckard, Mrs. Fowler, Mrs. Ratcliffe, Mrs. Webb, Mrs. Cox, Mrs. Tucker, Mrs. Speiden, Mrs. Todd, Mrs. Hill, Mrs. Morrell, Miss Evelett, Mrs. Branner, Mrs. J. C. G. Kennedy, Mrs. J. C. Kennedy, Mrs. Dr. Young, Mrs. Coues, Mrs. Kahl, Mrs. J. P. Ingle.

Mrs. MORROW, Treasurer.

Mrs. P. D. GURLEY, Sec.

Island.—The population of Providence, Rhode Island, is 47,785.

Names of the Rulers of the World.

We publish this morning a list of the names of the illustrious personages—male and female—who held the government in chief of the principal divisions of the world, in Europe, Asia, Africa, the United States, and Central and South America, in their hands, at the close of the past year, which will be found useful for reference in these days of sudden dynastic changes. The date of their accession to full power, in either the kingdom or State over which they exercised it, is also recorded:

Country.	Name of Ruler.	Title.	Date of Accession.
Great Britain.	Victoria	Queen	1837
France.	Napoleon III.	Emperor	1852
Austria.	Francis Joseph I.	Emperor	1848
Prussia.	William I.	King	1848
Spain.	Isabella II.	Queen	1833
Portugal.	Maria II.	Queen	1826
Italy.	Victor Emmanuel II.	King	1831
Sweden and Norway.	Oscar I.	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696
Russia.	Nicholas I.	Czar	1825
Sweden.	Charles XV.	King	1872
Norway.	Oslo	King	1844
Denmark.	Christian IX.	King	1848
Belgium.	Leopold I.	King	1835
Holland.	William III.	King	1840
Switzerland.	Friedrich VII.	King	1848
Germany.	Frederick III.	King	1888
Poland.	Jan Sobieski	King	1696